Case 3:06-cv-05563-FDB Document 20	Filed 01/29/07 Page 1 of 2
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
CHARLES THOMAS Jr.,	
Petitioner,	C N COC 55(2 FDP
v.	Case No. C06-5563 FDB ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE
HAROLD W. CLARKE,	OF APPEALABILITY
Respondent.	
This matter comes before the Court on Mo	tion for Certificate of Appealability.
A court will issue a certificate only when a petitioner has made "a substantial showing of the	
denial of a constitutional right ." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To satisfy this standard the petitioner must	
show that reasonable jurists would find the court's decision on the merits to be debatable or are	
adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further. <u>Slack v. McDaniel</u> , 529 U.S. 473, 484	
(2000). Plaintiff has failed to make the requisite sh	nowing.
Petitioner challenges a 2001 Pierce County	conviction and raises Sixth Amendment claims in
ght of the United States Supreme Court ruling in <u>Crawford v. Washington</u> , 541 U.S. 36 (2004).	

ligh The Ninth Circuit has held the Crawford decision regarding the Sixth Amendment right to confrontation applies retroactively to cases on collateral review. See, Bockting v. Bayer, 399 F.3d

ORDER - 1

Case 3:06-cv-05563-FDB Document 20 Filed 01/29/07 Page 2 of 2

1	1010 (9th Cir. 2005); amended 408 F.3d 1127; cert. granted sub. nom. Whorton v. Bockting,
2	U.S 126 S.Ct. 2017(2006).
3	The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) provides a one-year limitations
4	period for habeas applications. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). Under subsection (c) the year commences to
5	run from "the date on which the constitutional right asserted was newly recognized by the
6	Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review." § 2244(d)(1)(c).
7	<u>Crawford</u> was decided on March 8, 2004. On February 22, 2005, the Ninth Circuit held <u>Crawford</u>
8	retroactive to collateral review. Applying § 2244(d)(1)(c), the one-year statute of limitations
9	commenced to run the date <u>Crawford</u> was decided, making the petition untimely. See, <u>Dodd v.</u>
10	<u>United States</u> , 545 U.S. 353 (2005).
11	
12	ACCORDINGLY,
13	IT IS ORDERED:
14	The Motion for Certificate of Appealability [Dkt # 18] is DENIED .
15	
16	DATED this 29th day of January, 2007.
17	
18	
19	fall of
20	FRANKLIN D. BURGESS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	ORDER - 2